

Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee

Meeting 4 Notes

June 23, 2004

Moses Lake

Members & Alternates:

Bob Alberts	Tom Fox	Rachael Paschal-	Mark Tompkins
Karen Allston	David Fujimoto	Osborne	Frank Triplett
Bruce Beauchene	David Johnson	Jerry Peterson	Judy Turpin
Greg Brizendine	Connie Krueger	Gary Rhoades	Dawn Vyvyan
Marla Carter	Howard Laughery	George Schlender	Tim Wilson
Lynn Coleman	Bob Pancoast	Denise Smith	Donald Wright
Gene Eckhardt		Debbie Thomas	
Andrew Graham			
Richard Gustav			

DOH Staff & Consultants

Laird Harris	Denise Clifford	Jim Rioux
Cynara Lilly	Jennifer Kropack	Rich Siffert
Barbara Smith	Deana Pavwoski	Scott Torpie
		Michele Vasquez

Others:

Danford Moore	John Kounts
---------------	-------------

I. Introduction

A. Introduction

Denise Clifford and Jim Rioux clarified that these are the items that they heard needed to be addressed in terms of running the meetings:

1. More substance
2. Moving to slowly
3. Concerns of facilitation

B. Walk through of Agenda

C. Housekeeping

Jim proposes working in between the meetings in order to move more quickly.

- a. ACTION: Jim will prepare a brief write up from the discussion on Directional Statements from the Legislature (Meeting 3). Jim

proposed that Bob Pancoast, Judy Turpin, and Tim Wilson provide an initial review the document before it is sent to the full committee. A revised draft will be sent to the entire subcommittee for review on July 9. Volunteers are asked to participate in helping DOH address the two objectives of the topic list: 1) Covering all essential bases and 2) Addressing a reasonable timeline of finishing our work.

- D. ACTION: Subcommittee members will approach Jim if they are interested in helping with this task

II. Presentation: Whitworth Water District

A. Rate Setting Public Process

Susan McGeorge presented the public process that Whitworth Water District went through.

B. Subcommittee Discussion: Conservation Planning

Laird Harris facilitated a discussion on several elements of the Conservation Planning Requirements (CPR) and whether or not they provided either an adequate starting point or the correct elements to begin building rule recommendations from.

C. Conservation Plan Outline (Pages 4 and 5 in the CPR)

After discussion it was generally agreed by WUES guidelines in pages 4 and 5 of the CPR were a sufficient starting point and included the right elements for the purpose of the law.

Several members brought up the issue of goal setting which will be addressed in a future meeting.

D. Water Use Data Collection requirements for Public Water System (Pages 7, 8, and 9 in the CPR)

The Data Collection and Reporting Work Group has been charged with coming up with the proposal on data collections standards based on the elements included on page 7, 8, and 9 in the CPR. Discussion points by some WUES members included the need to consider different determining factors for system size. Many members asked that the data collection portion be kept fairly simple.

E. Demand Forecasting (Page 12 in the CPR)

While WUES generally agreed that the elements in the CPR were good starting points; some members felt the need to add to the required elements. As there is no work group established, it will have to be addressed by the committee. Suggestions included taking a multiple options approach to demand forecasting as well as addressing both supply and demand. During the discussion it became clear that not everyone was familiar with what the process is.

1. ACTION: WUES will examine WAC 246 290 100 4 d IV.

Possible presentation on demand forecasting by a utility member was discussed and placed in the parking lot for future consideration

F. Conservation Program (Pages 15, 16 and 17 of the CPR)

Several members of WUES felt that this section was inadequate as a starting point and needs to be reconsidered and rewritten by WUES. Considering process v. outcome and internal v. external measures were two major considerations suggested by WUES members. Some WUES members felt that base line requirements and leakage standards also need to be addressed.

III. Public Comment

A. Jim clarified what he felt he had heard during the first part of the discussion

1. Generally the CPR are a good place to start but WUES should focus more on the elements than on creating a prescriptive outline
2. The data collection work group needs to focus on finding meaningful data
3. A better understanding of demand forecasting procedures is needed
4. There are a lot of questions surrounding planning process

B. Susan McGeorge encouraged the subcommittee to recognize that:

1. When looking at conservation measures, there are some measures that are outside of the control of some water system (i.e. ordinances regulating landscape).
2. They should look at things happening outside of Washington.
3. Water systems should be able to choose the measures that are appropriate for them to implement. There should not be any conservation measures that are required to implement.
4. Every utility is different and DOH and the committee should reach out to other utilities and get their input.

IV. Lunch and return to Conservation Planning Discussion

A. Program Evaluation, Page 18 in the CPR

1. The group suggested that the meaning of evaluation evidence must be considered. Additionally, some members felt that effort and performance need to be a part of evaluation. Clarifying rule v. guidance was an underlying issue. Taking fluctuation as well as elements that are difficult to quantify such as education was also mentioned as a fact to consider.
2. For-profit systems were discussed as something to be considered.
3. Level of compliance and DOH authority also discussed.
4. Regional authority and requirements were discussed
 - a. ACTION: Jim will find information on regional responsibilities to be discussed in a future meeting

B. Small Systems

C. Exercise Outline-Conservation Planning

1. Keeping guidelines simple for smaller systems was discussed.
2. It was also noted that small systems are very different from each other and harder to categorize (i.e. east v. west; expanding v. non-expanding, etc)
3. There was discussion of how regulating/working with small systems would function and would more or fewer systems now fall under the law/planning requirements.
4. ACTION: Jim will check with DOH Asst. Attorney General to determine if the language in the MWL increases the planning requirements for smaller systems that re not required to complete a full water system plan,
5. A discussion about whether or not DOH could impose non-cost effective measures on systems arose.

V. Work Groups

The subcommittee discussed the formation of three workgroups. Additional members were added to the each work group. There was concern about the lack representation from mid-sized utilities in the work groups. Jim clarified that the charge of the work groups is to come up with a range of options.

Information on each work group, including their meeting schedule and materials, will be sent to all members and alternates.

A. Performance Reporting and Accountability

Judy Turpin was added to this group.

B. Cost Effectiveness

Karen Allston, Dawn Vyvyan, Bob Alberts, Denise Smith and Marla Carter were added.

C. Data Collection and Reporting

Shirley Nixon, Rachel Pascal and David Johnson were added to this group.

Note 1: After the work group discussion Marla Carter indicated that she might prefer working with the Data Collection and Reporting Work Group. This was brought to the attention of Gary Rhoades. Gary contacted Marla and as a result of that conversation Marla will move to the Data Collection and Reporting Work Group.

Note 2: DOH reviewed the e-mail responses that had been received and noted that Randy Black had not indicated a clear preference in regard to which work group he wanted to be part of. This was also brought to the attention of Gary Rhoades. Gary contacted Randy and as a result of that conversation Randy will move to the Performance Reporting and Accountability Work Group.

VI. Subcommittee Discussion: Public Process (Postponed until a future meeting)

VII. Presentation: Distribution System Leakage

VIII. Meeting Wrap up

A. Meeting notes from meetings 2 and 3 explained.

ACTION: Subcommittee will review and comment to Jim

B. Bob Pancoast, Gary Rhoades, Rich Gustav, Karen Allston, and David Johnson will participate in a planning meeting for topic list.

C. The definition of inchoate was questioned.

ACTION: Jim will bring the definition of inchoate to the group

D. Outreach will begin. An electronic survey will go to interested parties as well as WUE members

ACTION: Denise Clifford and Barbara Smith will provide summary documents of outreach results

E. Denise Clifford encouraged the group to participate in the survey.